UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,422	07/02/2003	Lucy M. Bull	B500790	5145
23911 CROWELL & I	7590 04/10/200 MORING LLP	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY GRO	SINGH, PREM C		
P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/613,422	BULL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	PREM C. SINGH	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a final rejection rejec	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b)      will will     wi	-	-
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5-18,21,22,25-27 and 30-33</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 and argument that the catalyst in Cain is an iron catalyst and significant numbers of prior literature suggest that this was a bulk, unsupported iron catalyst. The Applicant cites US Patent 7,259,286 to argue that supported iron catalysts are not preferred. Thus, it would by no means be inherent in the process of Cain that Al contamination would be present.

The Applicant's argument is not persuasive because patent '286 prefers bulk catalyst when iron content more than 30 wt% is needed. Patent '286 also cites 5 different patents using iron supported on alumina for improved catalyst attrition resistance (See column 2, lines 40-51). It is further to be noted that in addition to Moore, a number of prior arts disclose using iron catalyst supported on alumina (See for example: Arcuri et al: US 2001/0021724 A1; paragraph 0051 and 0064; Dyer et al: US Patent 4,619,910; column 4, lines 14-36; column 5, lines 4-20; Schanke et al: column 5, lines 10-60). Obviously, the catalyst used by Cain inherently has AI contamination.

Applicant's other arguments are similar to those presented earlier and addressed by the examiner (See Office action dated:01/08/2009, paragraph 8-13).

In conclusion, the claimed invention is prima facie obvious over combined teachings of Cain, Moore and Zhou.

/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797